

U.S. Appln. No. 09/765,005
Reply to Office Action dated May 19, 2005

PATENT
450100-02946

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 3-5 and 7-9 are currently pending. Claims 1, 2, and 6 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claim 3 is independent. Claims 3 and 5 are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, particularly in paragraphs [0054], [0105], and [0113]. No new matter has been introduced. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Pending claims 3, 4, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,493,409 to Maeda et al. (hereinafter, merely "Maeda").

Claim 3, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

"...a data memory unit including a video recorder portion; and

a data processing unit including a printer unit for printing picture data,

...

wherein said data input/output unit includes means for selecting still picture data, from among a series of moving motion picture data, to allow printing of said still picture data through said printing unit. (emphasis added)

U.S. Appln. No. 09/765,005
Reply to Office Action dated May 19, 2005

PATENT
450100-02946

As understood by Applicants, Maeda relates to a **still video camera** including a printer for printing a photographed image on print paper. The printer has a plurality of printing modes and a plurality of sorts of image data for the photographed image are produced.

Applicants submit that Maeda is directed to a **still picture camera printer unit**.

It is respectfully submitted that Maeda does not teach or suggest the above-recited features of claim 3. Specifically, Maeda does not teach or suggest selecting still picture data, from among a series of moving motion picture data, as recited in claim 3. The camera-integrated Video Tape Recorder including the printer mechanism according to the instant invention has such an additional advantage in comparison with a still picture video camera that because said invention can "print instantaneously any portion or scene of motion pictures currently being taken or being reproduced later from the video tape or the like whenever the operator wants to have it printed as a still picture, the user needs not to be alert always aiming at a single best camera scene as required for the still picture video camera, can keep shooting camera at ease, and then select and print the best scene later pondering with ample time spent" (paragraph [0113] in specification).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 3 is patentable.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Pending claims 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over Maeda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,750,901 to Silverbrook (hereinafter, merely "Silverbrook").

As understood by Applicants, Silverbrook relates to a **still picture camera** that has an internal printer in a detachable module. As argued above, Silverbrook is directed to a still

U.S. Appln. No. 09/765,005
Reply to Office Action dated May 19, 2005

PATENT
450100-02946

picture camera printer unit, as in contrast to a motion picture camera printer unit, and does not teach or suggest the above-recited features of claim 3.

It is respectfully submitted, that nothing in Maeda or Silverbrook, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above-recited features of claim 3, on which claims 5 and 8 are dependent.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 5 and 8 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from claim 3, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

U.S. Appln. No. 09/765,005
Reply to Office Action dated May 19, 2005

PATENT
450100-02946

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By Thomas F. Presson
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800